REMARKS

Claims 1 - 11 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, the abstract

and claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 - 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is

respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated

February 15, 2005.

Specification Objections:

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it is greater than 150

words in length. However, the abstract has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections:

Claims 1 - 11 are objected to due to a lack of compliance with a variety of informalities.

However, claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 - 11 have been amended to overcome these various claim

objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of theses claims objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to

non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner argues that the method recited in claim 11 is not within the technological

arts. It is further argued that the recitation of storage of information would be a trivial

application of technology even if an electronic database were recited, since information can be

stored in one's head.

However, claim 11 has been amended recite a network which is used in implementing the

steps recited. Such a network is disclosed, for instance, at page 1, line 23 to page 2, and line 10.

It is submitted that use of such a network is within the technological arts and is sufficient to

render claim 11 patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is

respectfully requested.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated

by Hulls et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0032229).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 11 have each been amended to recite that the agent

performs a "physical investigation" of a product. For example, the specification discloses such a

physical investigation at page 6, lines 10-19.

In Hulls, the agent appears to be involved in aiding buyers and sellers with listing and

searching items for sale. In other words, the agent helps the buyer and seller to contact each

other. Please see, for instance, abstract and paragraph [0031]. However, Hulls contains no

disclosure or suggestion of an agent physically inspecting a product as disclosed in the

specification. In fact, it is evident from Figure 1 of Hulls that the agent's only contact with other

parties is electronic.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hulls fails to anticipate the features of

independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 11, as amended, since Hulls fails to disclose or fairly suggest

the a physical investigation of the product by an agent.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hulls in further view of Official Notice.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejects these dependent claims on the basis of Official Notice directed

towards the obviousness of designating a level of investigation, deadline for investigation, and

the use of a computer-readable medium.

Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111

Serial No. 10/030,098

Attorney Docket No. 011713

However, applicants respectfully demand that the Examiner provide evidence to support

his position regarding the taking of Official Notice. In addition, it is submitted that the Official

Notice does not address a physical investigation. Moreover, it is submitted that dependent claims

3, 6, 8, and 10 are patentable due to their respective dependence on independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9,

and 11.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants

request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111 Serial No. 10/030,098 Attorney Docket No. 011713

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

Westerman, Hattori, Daniels & Adrian, LLP

Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450

Telephone: (202) 822-1100 Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/jl